

REMARKS

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated February 19, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 remain pending in the application and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Burgess (previously of record) and in view of Lapstun (U.S.P. 6,724,374). Applicant respectfully submits the following arguments in traversal of the prior art rejection.

Turning to the claimed invention, the invention includes a communication system including two conductive layers having plural communication elements connected to the first and second conductive layers. A first of plural communication elements initiates transmission to a second one of the plurality of communication elements to control a voltage between the layers. The transmitted signal includes an ID element identifying a communication element which is to subsequently receive the signal. A recipient communication element determines whether a signal is destined for that element by referring to the ID included in the signal.

The deficiencies of the base reference Burgess are set forth in the Amendment dated November 26, 2007. In particular, Burgess relates to a set of piezoelectric elements to indicate the proximity of a person to machinery on a workshop floor. Based on such proximity, the machinery may be turned on or off. Accordingly, there is no initiation of signal transmission between first and second communication elements as claimed. At best, the piezoelectric elements determine the presence of a person based on weight distribution resulting in a compressive force or a shear force detection. Col. 2, lines 51-60.

The Examiner now correctly concedes that Burgess fails to disclose assignment of an ID for identifying an element and a signal with an ID element, and wherein the recipient communication element determines whether a signal is destined to the element by referring to the ID. The Examiner cites Lapstun to make up for this deficiency. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is not supportable.

Lapstun relates to an electronic ink or an electronic paper. Electrodes on a “writing” surface are associated with reference points to detect the passage of a sensing device (marking device) near a surface of the surface to detect “writing” movement. As a result of the sensing, a visual display can be made, and the data of the sensing device can be transmitted to a computer system such that the sensed data can be stored to a computer. See Lapstun, col. 13, lines 58-67 and col. 16, lines 35-38 and col. 7, lines 1-7.

The Examiner cites cols. 6-7 generally as teaching the signal transmission of an ID. However, the cited portion relates to transmission of the sensing device (netpage pen) to a printer element via a radio link, and communication of netpage information via an internet. The Examiner appears to be assuming that the ID information associated with the internet units comprise the ID information as claimed. However, it is noted that the ID information for the communication elements as claimed are connected to the first and second conductive layers. Even assuming that the ID information is present in the internet communication, such communication are not among the communication elements, connected to the first and second conductive layers as claimed. The signal ID generally, is insufficient to teach the more specific elements of claim 1.

Applicant further respectfully submits that the Examiner’s rationale for combining Burgess and Lapstun has no support in the art. The Examiner contends that the motivation is to

allow a recipient element to determine whether a signal is destined for it by referring to the ID.

The Examiner cites col. 3, lines 35-66 of Lapstun to support the motivation to combine.

However, the cited portion does not relate to identification ID related to recipient information.

Rather, the cited portion describes how the state of a medium is changed in response to a sensing device. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable for at least these reasons.

Applicant submits that claim 10 is patentable for reasons analogous to claim 1 as set forth above. Claims 2-9 and 11-17 are patentable based on their dependency. With further regard to claims 8 and 17, these claims describe an ascending order of communication management capabilities of the elements. The Examiner cites cols. 11-12 of Burgess to teach these features. However, the cited portion of Burgess only teaches spacer elements and conductive layers, but not communication elements with an order of management capabilities. Therefore, claims 8 and 17 are patentable for this additional reason.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Susan Perreé
Registration No. 41,239

Date: May 13, 2008